



2-2-05

IFW

In the United States Patent And Trademark Office

Appn. Number; 10/644,541

Appn. Filed; 08-20-2003

Applicant; Arthur Kaliski
P. O. Box 1513
Amagansett, NY 11930

Title; A self regulating rotor

Examiner Christopher Verdier
Art Unit 3745

"Express mail" mailing label number;

ED 097307485 US

Date of Deposit; 2-1-05

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

I hereby certify this correspondence is being deposited
with the United States Postal Service as first class mail,
postpaid in an envelope, addresses to Commissioner for
Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

on 2-1-05 Signed Arthur Kaliski
Arthur Kaliski

Sir;

In response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed November 16, 2004, please
amend the application in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.121, as follows;

Summary of Telephone Office Interview is shown on page 1 of this paper.

Amendments to the Abstract are shown on page 2 of this paper.

Amendments to the Specification are shown on page 3 of this paper.

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of the claims which begin on
page 11 of this paper.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 13 of this paper.

Application Serial No.: 10/644,541

Amdt. dated 1/31/05

Reply to Office Action of November 16, 2004

Summary of Telephone Office Interview

Application No, 10/644,541
Applicant; Arthur Kaliski
Examiner; Christopher Verdier Art Unit 3745
Date of Interview; 28 January 2005

Claims discussed; 1-2.
Prior art discussed; Riezinstein 4,718,822
Agreement with respect to the claims was reached.

The Applicant faxed a draft copy of an amendment in response to the office action of November 16, 2004. Applicant argued that in Riezinstein, the rotor cups do not rotate into a totally closed three dimensional shape. The examiner disagreed and stated that figure 3 thereof shows that the rotor is almost fully closed, and still forms a three dimensional shape when closed. The examiner further indicated that the claims do not recite that the rotor is fully closed, and that even if claim 1 were amended to overcome Riezenstein, other references of record taught this feature. Applicant inquired as to amending claim 1 to recite that the rotor allows cup overlaps less than 50%. The examiner indicated that this new limitation was not searched and no opinion as to the patentability of this feature could be given at this time. Applicant stated that the clutch of the patent application is different from the springs 66 of Riezenstein. After Applicant's explanation of the operation of the clutch of the patent application, the examiner indicated that claim 1 would be allowable if claim 2 were canceled and claim 1 were amended to recite a clutch system attached to the rotor, with the clutch system comprising pulleys connected to the cup shafts, with the clutch system using the rotational energy of the rotating rotor to close the rotor cups into the closed shape.